

Remarks

Claims 1-15 are pending herein. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 8 have been amended, and new claims 12-15 have been added. Claims 4 and 5 have been made to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 2, and therefore have been placed in independent form. A check in the amount of \$200.00 is submitted herewith as this case now includes four independent claims.

Claims 1 and 2 have both been amended to recite that the common drive means includes a single motor and driving force transmitting members that transmit driving force generated by the single motor to the two rotors to drive the rotors for rotation, respectively. Support for this language can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 8, lines 28-30; and page 13, lines 25-28.

New claims 12 and 13 depend upon claims 1 and 2, respectively, and recite that the rotors have respective rotation axes which are not aligned with each other. Support for this recitation is seen from any of Figures 1, 7, or 8. The rotors rotate along different (not the same) axial axes.

New claims 14 and 15 depend upon claims 1 and 2, respectively, and recite that the driving force transmitting members comprise endless belts. Support for this recitation can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 13, lines 25-28.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,470,708 to Weil et al. ("Weil"); claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weil in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,710 to Boles et al. ("Boles"); and claim 10 is rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weil in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,889,742 to Rush et al. ("Rush"). Claims 4 and 5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and objection set forth in the Office Action.



I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 11

Claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Weil. Applicants respectfully submit that Weil does not anticipate claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 11.

As pointed out above, claims 1 and 2 have both been amended to recite that the common drive means includes a single motor and driving force transmitting members that transmit driving force generated by the single motor to the two rotors to drive the rotors for rotation, respectively. Claims 3, 6, 9 and 11 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 2 and, therefore, also include the particular common drive means recited in amended claim 2.

As can be seen from Figures 1-3 therein, Weil does not teach the specific common drive means recited in amended claims 1 and 2. Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Weil does not anticipate instant claims 1-3, 6, 9 and 11.

II. Rejection of Claims 7 and 8

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weil in view of Boles. Boles is cited for its disclosure of a dew point controller.

Claims 7 and 8 both depend upon claim 2 and, therefore, both include the specific common drive means recited in amended claim 2. As noted above, Weil does not teach or suggest the common drive means recited in amended claim 2. Boles also does not teach such common drive means. Boles only teaches a single rotor or wheel (20) and, therefore, does not teach or suggest a need for a “common” drive means.

Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 7 and 8 would not have been obvious over Weil in view of Boles.

III. Rejection of Claim 10

Claim 10 is rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weil in view of Rush. Rush is cited for teaching an intermittent rotor rotation for a partitioning member.

Claim 10 depends upon claim 2 and, therefore, includes the specific common drive means recited in amended claim 2. As noted above, Weil does not teach or suggest the common drive means recited in amended claim 2. Rush also does not teach such common drive means.

Thus, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 would not have been obvious over Weil in view of Rush.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 and 5 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 4 and 5 both have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 2. Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 4 and 5 should be allowed.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections and objection set forth in the Office Action be withdrawn and that claims 1-15 be allowed.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account 02-4300; Order No. 033082M247.

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch – Registration No. 32,263
1850 M Street, NW – Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036
Tel : 202 263 4300
Fax : 202 263 4329

Date : November 13, 2006

MAM/MM/cj